

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 4. This sheet, which includes Fig. 4, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Submitted with the present response is a substitute Figure 4 correcting a minor informality in original Figure 4. More specifically, in substitute Figure 4, line 5 from the bottom, the previous term "DocumentElement (\$a, \$y)" is now properly indicated as "DocumentElement (\$a, \$b)".

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over "Logic Programming with the World-Wide Web" to Loke et al. (herein "Loke").

Addressing the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note each of claims 1-9 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, claim 1 is now directed to a "processor implementing" method. Further, claim 5 now recites a "processor implemented abstract link extracting device" and a "processor implemented document link generating device". Similarly independent claim 9 now recites "processor implemented means for extracting" and "processor implemented means for generating". The claim amendments are believed to address the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Applicants also submit that the previous rejection was improper as claims 1-4 were clearly directed to a statutory class of a process and claims 5-9 were clearly directed to a statutory class of an apparatus. Also, the claims clearly set forth practical applications in the art, in contrast to the position in the Office Action. However, to promote prosecution, the claims are herein amended to even further set forth statutory subject matter.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit claims 1-9 are in full compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Loke, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Each of independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, those claims clarify that the abstract link establishes a plurality of links between a plurality of portions of a first document and a portion of a second document. Further, in the claims those plural portions in the first document for which the links are established have the same information. Thus, with the claimed invention, each of plural portions of a first document that have the same information can be linked to a same portion in a second document. As a result, plural portions in a first document that have the same information, and which accordingly are to reference a same portion in a second document, can be easily linked to that same portion in the same document.

Applicants respectfully submit the above-noted features are clearly set forth in the specification, see as a non-limiting example the discussion at page 9, line 30 et seq. Further, applicants respectfully submit the claim features clearly distinguish over the applied art.

First, Loke was not relied upon with respect to the above-noted features of establishing an abstract link between each of plural portions of a first document having the same information and a portion of a second document, and Loke does not in fact disclose such features.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit Loke does not disclose or suggest any type of “abstract link”. Loke is directed to a device known as LogicWeb that enables programmable behavior and state to be incorporated into web pages, allowing the web pages to be viewed as modules or objects with state.¹ Loke at most discloses a URL, a pointer, and more complex parsing, but Loke does not disclose or suggest any type of “abstract link”.

¹ Loke, abstract.

With respect to the above-noted argument, the outstanding Office Action states in paragraph 29 "it should be noted that the Office has interpreted that phrase ["abstract link"] and the entire claimed invention in the ***broadest sense possible***" (emphasis added).

In response to that basis for the outstanding rejection, applicants submit such a statement emphasizes that the outstanding rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully submit that claims can only be interpreted in the broadest ***reasonable*** sense possible, see M.P.E.P. § 2111, and applicants respectfully submit that has not been done in the Office Action, as apparently even recognized in the Office Action. The claims must be interpreted consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach, which applicants submit has been done.

For these foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM/SNS/law
I:\ATTY\SNS\197894US-AM.DOC

Docket No.: 197894US-2



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION: Toshihiko ODA

SERIAL NO.: 09/708,599

GAU: 2176

RCE Herewith

EXAMINER: HILLERY, NATHAN

FILED:

FOR: DOCUMENT LINK DESCRIPTION/GENERATION METHOD, APPARATUS AND
COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT

LETTER SUBMITTING REPLACEMENT DRAWING SHEET(S)

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
Alexandria, VA 22313

SIR:

Responsive to the below indicated communication, the following drawing sheets are submitted
herewith:

☒ 1 Replacement Drawing Sheet

☐ _____ New Drawing Sheets

☒ Official Action dated August 25, 2004

☐ Notice of Allowance/Issue Fee dated _____

☐ Other dated _____

The changes and/or modifications made include the following:

In substitute Figure 4, line 5 from the bottom, the previous term "DocumentElement (\$a, \$y)"
is now properly indicated as "DocumentElement (\$a, \$b).

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gregory J. Maier".

Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423